UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,516	12/31/2003	Dae-Ha Lee	3364P160	9238

8791   7590   11/06/2008
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER
KANE, CORDELIA P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2432	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/750,516	LEE ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		CORDELIA KANE	2432	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 September 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed September 17, 2008 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Scheidt fails to teach or suggest using a

single key to encrypt both the data and the digital signature. However, Pierce teaches a

session key used to encrypt the application data (page 2, paragraph 19). While Scheidt

may fail to teach the exact specific key being used to encrypt the signature, Scheidt

teaches encrypting the digital signature (column 17, lines 1-11), and Pierce teaches a

session key that is used to encrypt the application data (page 2, paragraph 19). Since

the digital signature would be part of the application data, in combination with Pierce the

digital signature would have been encrypted using the session key.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

3.   Claims 1 – 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Pierce in view of Scheidt further in view of Gruber.

4.   Referring to claims 1 and 10, Pierce discloses:

        a.   Creating a timestamp that includes an expiration time (page 7, paragraph

        76), and a security token (figure 4), and inserting them in the header (page 9,

        paragraph 89).

      b.   Encrypting data to be transferred with a secret key (page 2, paragraph 19, and inserting it in the body (page 8, paragraph 88).

      c.   Attaching a digital signature to create a signature, and inserting it in the header (page 8, paragraph 86).

      d.   Encrypting the secret key with the service key (page 7, paragraph 77) and inserting it in the header (page 9, paragraph 89). The key is encrypted in the token which is then in the header. Therefor the key is in the header. The service key could be a public key (page 4, paragraph 40).

5.   Pierce does not explicitly disclose the digital signature being encrypted in the header, or the header containing routing information. However, Scheidt discloses the header containing the creators identity, and labels to define the audience of the file (column 4, lines 53-61). Scheidt further discloses the digital signature being encrypted in the message header (column 17, lines 1-11) and that the digital signature is verification of the original signer of the message (column 6, lines 56-59).

6.   Pierce and Scheidt are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, securing data that is transferred. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Pierce and Scheidt before him or her, to modify Pierce to include the digital signature encryption, and recipient information of Scheidt. The motivation for doing so would have been that so the signatory cannot deny having signed the object (column 6, lines 56-59).

7.   Pierce in view of Scheidt does not explicitly disclose a creation time. However, Gruber discloses indicating a start time and end time (page 2, paragraph 11).

8.   Pierce, Scheidt and Gruber are analogous art because they are from the same
field of endeavor, securing data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious
to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Pierce, Scheidt and Gruber
before him or her, to modify Pierce in view of Scheidt to include the creation time and
expiration of Gruber. The motivation for doing so would have been to make clear when
the approval started.

9.   Referring to claim 2, Pierce teaches that the session key is used to both encrypt
(page 2, paragraph 19) and decrypt (page 2, paragraph 21) the data . It is inherent that
the session key is symmetric.

10.   Referring to claim 3, Pierce teaches that the public key encryption done on the
secret key is asymmetric (page 4, paragraph 40).

11.   Referring to claim 4, since a SOAP message is XML (Pierce, Page 8, Paragraph
83) it is understood that the encryption would be using an XML algorithm.

12.   Referring to claims 5 and 11, Pierce teaches:

        e.   Acquiring a certificate for verifying a signature of the SOAP message
        (page 8, paragraph 86).

        f.   Decrypting an encrypted key in the security header(page 7, paragraph 71)
        with a private key (page 4, paragraph 40).

        g.   Inserting a digital signature in the header (page 8, paragraph 86).

        h.   Verifying the signature is not specifically stated, but Pierce does state that
        the system would be able to check the validity of the signature (page 8,
        paragraph 86).

      i.   Decrypting the encrypted data in the SOAP body with the secret key (page

      2, paragraph 21).

13.   Pierce does not explicitly disclose decrypting the digital signature or the header

containing routing information. However, Scheidt discloses the header containing the

creators identity, and labels to define the audience of the file (column 4, lines 53-61).

Scheidt goes on to disclose the digital signature being decrypted (column 17, lines 18-

20) and that the digital signature is verification of the original signer of the message

(column 6, lines 56-59).

14.   Pierce and Scheidt are analogous art because they are from the same field of

endeavor, securing data that is transferred. At the time of the invention, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Pierce and

Scheidt before him or her, to modify Pierce to include the digital signature decryption,

and recipient information of Scheidt. The motivation for doing so would have been that

so the signatory cannot deny having signed the object (column 6, lines 56-59).

15.   Pierce in view of Scheidt does not explicitly disclose the certificate being in the

security token which is in the header. However, Gruber discloses the token being a

certificate (page 2, paragraph 21) and that the header contains the token (page 5, claim

19). The token also contains a signature that verifies identification (page 4, paragraph

30).

16.   Pierce, Scheidt and Gruber are analogous art because they are from the same

field of endeavor, securing data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Pierce, Scheidt and Gruber

before him or her, to modify Pierce in view of Scheidt to include token being the
certificate that is in the header of Gruber. The motivation for doing so would have been
to be able to verify the identification (page 4, paragraph 30).

17.   Referring to claim 6, Pierce teaches the passing of the certificate as it is part of
the security-concerning information (page 8, paragraph 86). In the specification the
applicant defines a security token as security-concerning information.

18.   Referring to claim 7, Pierce teaches that the session key is used to both encrypt
(page 2, paragraph 19) and decrypt (page 2, paragraph 21) the data . It is inherent that
the session key is symmetric.

19.   Referring to claim 8, Pierce teaches that the public key encryption done on the
secret key is asymmetric (page 4, paragraph 40).

20.   Referring to claim 9, since a SOAP message is XML (Pierce, Page 8, Paragraph
83) it is understood that the encryption would be using an XML algorithm.

Conclusion

21.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time
policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within
TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not
mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the
shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to CORDELIA KANE whose telephone number is

(571)272-7771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00 -

5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 2432

/Gilberto Barron Jr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2432